

## **Remarks**

Claims 1, 3-10, 12-15 and 17, 18 and 24-29 are pending. The Examiner asserts the same grounds for rejection in the pending final Action as in the previous Action. The following remarks reply specifically to the Examiner's Response to Argument found at pages 8-10 of the final Action and note the Examiner's failure to address other distinguishing features. Applicants also direct the Examiner's attention to the detailed remarks submitted in response to the prior action which, for brevity, are not repeated here.

### **Claiming The Same Repository and a Common Interface**

The Examiner asserts, incorrectly, that the "features upon which applicant relies (i.e., accessing the **same** repository through a **common** interface) are not recited in the rejected claim(s)." Final Action page 9.

Claim 1 recites that each of the Web resources can make use of the same interface in order to access the user's personal repository. The method of Claim 15 includes the server transmitting to the client a portal Web page that includes information regarding a plurality of different Web resources that are configured to make use of the same interface to access the user's personal repository. The other independent claims, Claims 7, 24 and 25, recite a similar limitation.

"The" user's personal repository recited in this element of Claim 1 refers back to the earlier recitation of "a user having a personal repository." Although "a user" means one or more users and "a personal repository" means one or more personal repositories, the subsequent reference to **the** user's personal repository is still referring to the **same** repository whether that repository is a single repository or plural repositories possessed by a single user or plural users.

The "same" interface recited in this element of Claim 1 refers back to the earlier recitation of "an interface for accessing the user's personal repository." Although "an interface" means one or more interfaces, the subsequent reference to the **same** interface is still referring to an interface that is common to all of the Web resources whether that interface is a single interface or plural interfaces.

The Examiner's assertion to the contrary in item (1) at page 9 of the final Action is not correct. Claims 1, 7, 15, 24 and 25, therefore, distinguish patentably over the cited references for all of the reasons detailed in the Response to the prior Action.

#### Woods Marking Systems Supervisors Are Not the Claimed Interface

The Examiner also asserts in item (1) on page 9 of the final Action that Wood's marking systems supervisors 23 in Fig. 2 meet the claimed interface limitations. This assertion is not correct. Each printer 15, 15' and 15" in Wood includes a marking systems supervisor 23 -- Fig. 2 illustrates an exemplary printer typical of printers 15, 15' and 15" in Fig. 1. Wood column 4, lines 19-23. Wood does not teach or even suggest that each printer 15, 15' and 15" has access to a memory 37, 39 through any or all of the other printer's marking systems supervisor 23. On the contrary, Wood teaches only that each printer 15, 15' and 15" accesses a memory 37, 39 through its own marking systems supervisor 23 (to the extent it is correct even to say memory 37, 39 is accessed through a marking systems supervisor 23). Hence, Wood does not teach multiple printers accessing the same repository (or even different repositories) through the same interface.

If the Examiner disagrees, he is respectfully requested to specifically point out and explain those passages in Wood that might somehow reasonably be interpreted as teaching that each printer 15, 15' and 15" has access to a memory 37, 39 through any or all of the other printer's marking systems supervisor 23.

#### Browsable Database Of Web Resources

The Examiner does not appear to specifically address anywhere in the final Action the following distinguishing features recited in dependent Claims 3, 4, 9, 10 and 18. (The following remarks were presented in the Response to the prior Action.)

Claim 3, depending from Claim 1, recites that the web site includes a browsable database of information regarding web resources that are available over the network and that can make use of the interface in order to access the user's personal repository. Claim 4, depending from Claim 1, recites that the web site includes a browsable database of information regarding devices each respectively represented by a web resource available over the network that can make use of the interface in order to access the user's personal repository. Claims 9-10 and 18 recite similar limitations

The Examiner cites Gopalan as teaching the browsable database limitations added in these dependent claims. In so doing, however, the Examiner has ignored the content of the claimed database -- a database of web resources that can use the common interface to access the user's personal repository. Nowhere does the Examiner address the content of the claimed database. The database 416 in Gopalan, by contrast, is a database of print jobs, not a database of printers. In the context of the claimed subject matter, the Gopalan database represents a user repository of print job documents, not printers that can access the repository of print job documents. Hence, Gopalan does not teach the further limitations of Claims 3, 4, 9-10 and 18.

Advertising Web Resources That Can Use The Common Interface

The Examiner does not appear to specifically address anywhere in the final Action the following distinguishing features recited in dependent Claims 5, 8, 13 and 17. (The following remarks were presented in the Response to the prior Action.)

Claim 5, depending from Claim 1, adds the further limitation that the Web page includes an advertisement of a Web resource that can make use of the interface to access the user's personal repository. Claims 8, 13 and 17 recite similar limitations. The Examiner argues such limitations are inherent in Wood -- "web page has an inherent functionality that includes advertising hyperlink or banner .... (fig. 4; col. 2, lines 11-17; col. 3, line 49 - col. 4, line 7)." Office Action page 4.

Even if it is assumed that the inherent functionality in a web page includes the ability to advertise a web resource, such functionality does not render obvious any and all uses of that functionality. The plain fact is that Wood does not teach or even suggest advertising any web resource on any web page, specifically not advertising a printer that can make use of a common interface to access a document server. And, such advertising is not necessary to the functionality in Wood. In fact, Wood's failure to disclose the claimed common interface makes it totally irrelevant to the further limitation of Claim 5. To establish inherency, the Examiner must show that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference. If the Examiner continues to feel that the advertising limitations in Claims 5, 8, 13 and 17 is inherent in Wood, then he is respectfully requested to specifically point out and explain

how it is that Wood's remote web browser printer user interface display could not function without the claimed advertising.

All pending claims remain in condition for allowance.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the pending office action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven R. Ormiston/

Steven R.Ormiston

Reg. No. 35,784

Phone: 208-433-1991 x204